

From: Darian Calhoun [mailto:dariancalhoun@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2008 11:29 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Comments, North Central Coast

January 21, 2008

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of Sacramento and former resident of coastal areas in southern and central California. As an interested party I offer the following request and comments.

I, respectfully, request that no changes or expansions be made to existing MLPA's in the North Central Coast Area.

Expansion or change may not be warranted as elapsed time between establishing the original areas and this point is probably not long enough to allow monitoring to demonstrate real negatives or positives. Especially in the case of slow developing, long lived species. There doesn't seem to be any new monitoring information available to support expansion of MLPA's in the that area.

Expansion of existing State Marine Reserves (SMR's) or establishing additional closures in the north coast area will have negative economic impact for cities and counties that rely on commercial and recreational fishing activities, and tourism in those areas. A recent study of the value of recreational fishing, released by California Trout, provides some applicable information to support that conclusion.*

Expansion of MLPA's for estuarine environments may be ineffective as many upstream activities by human stressors will not be addressed by reducing or eliminating human interactions in the immediate area of estuaries. As a single example, wineries established in Alexander Valley contribute to very high levels of silt in the Navarro River and it's estuary due to the practice of sterile cultivation of grapes on the hillsides. Vegetation, other than grape vines, is eliminated so as to assure that all irrigation water is made available for the vines. There is very little if any effort made or capability available to retain excess water on those properties. Thus, run-off contaminated with insecticides enters the river and its estuary. Changing an existing MLPA in an estuary

where upstream activities of this or other agricultural or developmental nature would not appear to benefit conservation efforts.

The plan for implementation of these actions is heavily weighted towards conservation actions. Such as, reduction or elimination of human interactions or impacts and limits on or elimination of takings. The mission of DFG, “....is to manage....diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources....for their use and enjoyment by **the public**.” (emphasis added), it would appear that elimination of human interaction as a conservation action is in conflict with this mission statement.

There is a perception among the public that adoption of new or expanded MLPA's, involving closures, are seen as an easy choice to solving reduced enforcement capabilities due to lack of DFG staff for enforcement activities. It is apparent that chronic under funding of all operational areas of DFG contributes to that perception. Expanding or changing existing MLPA'S will not solve this problem and may lead to increased demands on the DFG staff time available for enforcement activities. Poachers probably will not be affected by the proposed changes or expansions.

As a fisherman who grew up fishing in the ocean, surf, near and off-shore, I've seen many increases in the cost of licenses, fees for stamps and cards, etc., while watching as access has been limited and limits reduced. As a believer that conservation measures are valuable. I support those that are effective. I'm unconvinced that the proposed actions will have any additional benefits over those currently in place.

Sincerely,

Darian Calhoun

JockScot@comcast.net

* The Value of recreational Fishing in California, Direct Financial Impacts, January 2008, Drafted by Carolyn Alkire, Phd., Contracted by California Trout.